



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1998

Effect of Breast Size on Hiring Decisions for Different Job Types

Carol Laurent Jarzyna
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jarzyna, Carol Laurent, "Effect of Breast Size on Hiring Decisions for Different Job Types" (1998).
Dissertations. 3752.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3752

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1998 Carol Laurent Jarzyna

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

EFFECT OF BREAST SIZE ON HIRING DECISIONS FOR DIFFERENT JOB TYPES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY
CAROL LAURENT JARZYNA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1998

Copyright by Carol Laurent Jarzyna, 1998

All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much thanks is given to Dr. R. Scott Tindale for his advice, encouragement, and criticism. Thanks also to Dr. Anne Sutter for her review of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
List of Illustrative Material	v
Abstract	vi
 Chapter 1: Introduction	 1
Chapter 2: Method	11
Chapter 3: Results	16
Chapter 4: Discussion	21
 Appendix A: List of Materials Used	 24
Appendix B: Actors' Script	26
Appendix C: Job Descriptions	31
Appendix D: Section of Applicant's Resume and Relevant Test Scores	33
Appendix E: Participant Sex/Breast Size Condition Schedule	35
Appendix F: Participant Instructions	37
Appendix G: Ratings Forms	39
Appendix H: Consent Form	43
Appendix I: Debriefing Form	45
Reference List	47
Vita	51

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

Correlation Matrix for Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary	18
---	----

ABSTRACT

This study used a 2 x 2 x 2 between-subjects design to evaluate whether there is an effect of an applicant's breast size on hiring decisions for clerical and managerial jobs. It was predicted that when the applicant appeared small-breasted she would be favored for the managerial position, but not for the clerical position. It was also predicted that when the applicant appeared large-breasted, she would be favored for the clerical position, but not for the managerial position. Participants were 202 male and female undergraduates. This study decreased the likelihood of confounding by using the same applicant for all conditions. The findings suggest that while there is no interaction effect between breast size and job type, there is a small effect of an applicant's breast size on the likelihood that she'll be hired. Further, this effect appears to be related to perceptions of the applicant's attractiveness.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of appearance-based evaluations

The effect of people's appearance on evaluations of them has most often been explained from an evolutionary perspective. The explanation is based on the fundamental psychological aspects underlying person perception. It holds that physical appearance affects person evaluation as a result of the normally adaptive process of making overgeneralizations based on people's physical characteristics. Evolutionarily, this process is beneficial and adaptive because overgeneralizing people, or stereotyping them, allows one to react to them more quickly, and often, more appropriately. This efficiency results in an individual having increased survival capability.

For instance, it was an evolutionary advantage for parents to judge infants as vulnerable and needy (Berry & McArthur, 1985). This process was advantageous because parents who recognized that their infants were vulnerable and needy cared for them. The children of these parents, and thus their species, survived. In this way, stereotyping infants based on their appearance increased survival at the species level. The result of this overgeneralizing across many epochs however, is that today, adults with child-like features are prejudged as more naive, vulnerable, and so forth (Berry & McArthur, 1985). The stereotyping process that helps people deem their infants needy is the same process that causes people to evaluate others based on their degree of physical attractiveness.

It is widely assumed that stereotypes about the physically attractive are favorable to this group. In the past few decades, this assumption has gained substantial empirical support. Several studies have demonstrated the "halo effect"-- the tendency to believe that people with one positive trait must have other positive traits as well (Gleitman,

1987). Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972) showed that the attractive are judged as having more desirable attributes and a greater possibility of success than are the unattractive. Similar evidence exists for the effects of attractiveness in academic (Felson, 1980) and occupational (Dippoye, Frompkin, & Wiback, 1975) settings. Recently, however, research has shown that there are specific circumstances to which the halo effect does not apply. For instance, there is evidence that attractiveness can be disadvantageous to women in managerial positions (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a; Heilman and Saruwatari, 1979).

Stereotypes about gender and the workplace

Heilman and Stopeck (1985a) found that in employee evaluations, attractive women were perceived as more feminine than women who were not attractive, and Gillen (1981) suggested that attractiveness leads to an increase in sex stereotyping. Heilman & Saruwatari (1979) found, in accordance with these findings, that attractiveness strengthens perceptions of gender stereotyping in work behaviors. Thus, attractive women should be perceived as more feminine than unattractive women, and attractive men should be perceived as more masculine than less attractive men. If femininity increases gender stereotyping, then attractive women should be more likely to be perceived as incompetent and weak in male-dominated positions than are unattractive women. The more attractive, and thus more sex-stereotyped women, should be seen as possessing exaggerated traits that are traditionally associated with femininity, such as emotional lability, submissiveness, and nurturance.

Not surprisingly, Heilman and Stopeck, (1985a) found results indicating that factors that make salient a woman's femininity elicit negative gender stereotypes when she works in a traditionally male position. Heilman (1983) found that women are perceived as incompetent and weak in achievement-oriented jobs, while the opposite is thought to be true of men. This results in employment bias against attractive women in traditionally male jobs.

Employment bias occurs when the perceived skills and traits of the applicant, which are often determined from sex stereotypes or other prejudices, do not match the skills required by the job. Heilman (1983) constructed the "Lack of Fit" model to explain this phenomenon. The model supplies a cognitive framework which attributes occupational sex bias not to hidden agendas or irrationality, but to rational thought. It presents sex bias as the logical outcome of the sex-typing of jobs and gender stereotyping.

The Lack of Fit model is based on the concept that an individual's success in a given position is a function of the person's attributes and the skills and abilities necessary for the position. A poor person-job fit is predictive of failure, while good person-job fit predicts success. For instance, a person who is believed to interact well with others and be submissive is a poor fit for a job requiring assertiveness and emotional detachment. Thus one would predict the person would not succeed in the position. However, one would predict success for this person in a job where facilitating social interaction and following orders are required. According to the model, the greater the lack of fit between the stereotype of what is necessary to do the job and the stereotype of women, the greater should be the resulting sex bias.

Preconceptions about an individual's attributes can be counterproductive because one's expectations may cause inaccurate assessment of the individual. Feldman (1981) showed that facts about an individual may be interpreted differently due to expectancies. Such inaccuracy has serious implications for employment decisions and evaluations, especially for women. The most powerful, esteemed, and high-paying organizational positions, such as managerial ones, are masculinely sex-typed. That is, it is generally believed that the skills necessary to do these jobs well are uniquely masculine (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985b). Most middle management positions are masculinely sex-typed (Schein, 1975) and male-dominated. Since masculine qualities are considered necessary

in these jobs, women who are perceived as being more feminine are disadvantaged in them (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979).

The stereotype of women is that they are less achievement-oriented than men, dependent, passive, uncompetitive, unconfident, and unambitious (Heilman, 1983). Women are also thought to be tender and concerned about others (Heilman, 1983). In contrast, men are stereotyped as independent, competitive, self-confident, ambitious, and not concerned about others (Heilman, 1983). According to these stereotypes, women would be a poor fit for managerial positions, which require emotional detachment, leadership ability, and assertion, and thus are predicted to be unsuccessful in these positions. Additionally, there is a cognitive inclination to perpetuate and confirm performance expectations (Heilman, 1983). The result is a compounded bias against women aspiring to succeed in masculinely sex-typed jobs. This bias may contribute to women being equally represented in the workforce, yet underrepresented in upper-level organizational positions (Heilman, 1983).

Breast size related biases against women in the workforce

Learning the effect of breast size on hiring decisions for managerial and clerical jobs will significantly contribute to the literature on occupational attractiveness bias for several reasons. The first reason is that breast size, one factor in a woman's overall physical attractiveness, has not been studied in relation to hiring decisions specifically. There is much literature on preferred breast size (Thompson & Tantleff, 1992; Wildman, Wildman, Brown, & Trice, 1976; Jacobi & Cash, 1994; Beck, Ward-Hull & McLearn, 1976; Kleinke & Staneski, 1980; Mazur, 1986; Gitter, Lomranz, Saxe, & Bar-Tal, 1983; Wiggins, Wiggins, & Conger, 1968). There is also literature on the effect of body weight on hiring decisions (Rothblum, Brand, Miller, & Oetjen, 1990; Pingitore, Dugoni, Tindale, & Spring, 1994). Finally, much literature exists about the effect of physical attractiveness on employment outcomes (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a,b; Dippoye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979; Klassen, Jasper, & Harris,

1993; McAdams, Moussavi, & Klassen, 1992). However there is a paucity of research examining specifically the effect of breast size on hiring decisions.

Research into breast size bias against women in certain occupational types is also important because there is evidence that stereotypes detrimental to job success are associated with large-breasted women (Beck, et al., 1976; Thompson & Tantleff, 1992; Kleinke & Staneski, 1980). Researchers estimate that at least one million and possibly over two million U.S. women have had breast augmentation (Terry, Skovron, Garbers, Sonnenschein, & Toniolo, 1995). With the removal of the FDA's 1992 moratorium on the use of augmentation devices, the development of new types of implants (Spiegler, 1996), and continued preference for large breasts (Jacobi & Cash, 1994), it is reasonable to assume that this number will greatly increase in coming years. If, as expected, having slightly large breasts is detrimental to women in masculinely stereotyped jobs, such surgeries may hinder women in traditionally male careers.

While many specific physical attributes influence one's level of attractiveness, most prior studies of occupational attractiveness bias have focused on the impact of attractiveness as a whole. The exception to this is the study of body weight, which has been studied separately, e.g., in studies conducted to determine the effect of being overweight on job processes (Pingitore, et al., 1994; Rothblum, et al., 1990). The present study was modeled after similar studies that examined the effect of body weight or attractiveness on employee evaluations and hiring decisions for different job types (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a; Pingitore, et al., 1994). Researchers in this area have experienced much success in discovering original findings as well as in replicating others' results. For instance, there is a great deal of empirical evidence indicating that the obese are discriminated against in employment processes (Klesges, Klem, Hanson, Eck, Ernst, O'Laughlin, Garrot, & Rife, 1990; Decker, 1987; Pingitore, et al, 1994; Rothblum, et al., 1990). Additionally, this effect has been shown to be especially true for women

(Pingitore, et al., 1994). Contributing research on the effect of breast size might expand this literature, particularly in its relation to women.

Breast size bias is clearly an issue that directly affects only women. The term "breast" refers to the mammary glands present on the front upper torso of a woman's body, which are undeveloped in healthy men (except through ingestion/injection of certain hormones). It is thus important not to confuse this term with the term "chest", which refers to the upper part of the torso encased by the ribs, in both men and women. While chest size is measured in inches, breast size is measured in cupsizes, mainly from A through D, with A being smaller and D being larger. A woman's chest size is independent of her breast size. A woman can have a chest size of 34 inches, with a cup size of A, B, C, or D. A man who appears to have breasts because he is overweight actually has only an increased chest size. The term "bust" technically refers to the distance in inches around the upper torso at the fullest part of the breasts. Therefore, bust size depends on both a woman's breast and chest size. Despite the technical definition, the term "bust" is almost always used synonymously with "breast" and hence refers only to the female physique.

The implications of breast size on perceived attractiveness, femininity, and personality

There is considerable evidence that some breast sizes are considered more attractive than others. A review of recent literature revealed that a slightly above average (thus labeled "large" in the present study) breast or bust size is seen by both males and females as the most attractive bust size, and that a moderately above average breast or bust size is perceived by males and females as second most attractive. Wildman, Wildman, Brown, and Trice (1976) found that the preferred breast cup size of males and females was a "B+," which was a size bigger than "B," but smaller than "C." While Thompson and Tantleff (1992) used a different measuring system, their results for men's and women's most ideal breast size were extremely similar to those found by Wildman et al. (1976). American and Israeli students found women with hourglass-shaped bodies

more attractive than those with pillar-shaped bodies, and large breasts more attractive than small breasts (Gitter, Lomranz, Saxe, & Bar-Tal, 1983). Jacobi and Cash (1994) found that women and men preferred a breast size that was slightly bigger than average. Men preferred women with larger breasts in a study conducted by Wiggins, Wiggins, and Conger (1968).

In practically all studies of breast size attractiveness, the equivalent to an A cup size received very low attractiveness ratings. The only article reviewed that noted a conflicting finding was that of Beck, Ward-Hull, and McLearn (1976). Even here women were found to prefer a moderate to slightly smaller than moderate breast size, which is still probably not as small as a size A cup. The wealth of evidence just presented overwhelmingly indicates that women with larger breasts are considered more attractive than those with smaller breasts.

Women with larger breasts are perceived as more feminine not only because attractiveness increases gender stereotyping (as was previously discussed) but independent of the attractiveness mediator as well. The literature supports that breasts are commonly associated with femininity (Birtchnell, Whitfield, & Lacey, 1990; Kaslow & Becker, 1992; Thompson & Tantleff, 1992) and nurturance (Birtchnell, et al., 1990; Thompson & Tantleff, 1992), and symbolize femininity, sensuality, fertility, and nurturance (Goin, 1982). Thompson and Tantleff (1992) found that large breasts were associated with nurturance and sexual activity. In fact, Birtchnell et al. (1990) found that one of the chief reasons women seek augmentation surgery is to feel more feminine, and offered that women have the surgery as a way of symbolically making up for a self-assessed decrement in femininity and womanliness. In reviewing the relevant literature, Kaslow and Becker (1992) conclude that reasons for obtaining breast augmentation cluster around doubts regarding one's femininity. Thus it is probable that there is a direct link between breast size and level of femininity stereotyping, even independent from breast size attractiveness.

Empirical evidence shows that women of differing breast sizes are stereotyped in different ways. For instance, Thompson and Tantleff (1992) had participants associate 11 adjectives with the body figures to which they corresponded. Figures were frontal illustrations of women with breast sizes varying from very small to very large. Both male and female participants associated the descriptors "sexually active," "popular," "nurturant," and "confident," with the large-breasted women, whom they also deemed more attractive. Slightly small-breasted women were deemed "intelligent" and "athletic," and extremely small-breasted women were associated with the descriptors "depressed" and "lonely."

Some research suggests that large-breasted women are presumed to possess more traits that are detrimental to job performance than small-breasted women. Kleinke and Staneski (1980) found that large-breasted stimulus women were perceived as relatively unintelligent, incompetent, immoral, and immodest, while small-breasted stimulus women were perceived as intelligent, competent, modest, and moral. This finding was consistent across all four experiments they conducted as part of their study.

Based on the evidence just presented, a woman who obtains a larger breast size through cosmetic surgery could actually be hindering her career success in doing so for three reasons. First, having a slightly larger than average breast size increases a woman's overall degree of attractiveness, therefore increasing femininity stereotypes about her. Second, having a slightly larger than average breast size should increase female stereotypes about a woman independent of the attractiveness mediator. Third, having a slightly larger than average breast size increases stereotypes that are unrelated to femininity, yet still detrimental to job success in traditionally male positions. Thus it is important to provide women in managerial, or other male sex-typed positions with the knowledge that because of the implications of breast size on a woman's attractiveness and femininity, increasing one's breast size to the slightly larger, preferred size, could be detrimental to their careers.

The present study

The present research will consider breast size bias against women in different occupational types. The job categories in this study were chosen based on their degree of traditionally masculine or feminine orientation, as determined by Heilman and Stopeck (1985a). In their study, managerial positions rated 7.8, while clerical positions rated 4.7 on a 9-point scale, where "masculine" was 9, and "feminine" was 1.

In most prior studies on physical appearance, stimulus persons were pre-rated on the relevant variables (e.g. attractiveness or weight) and then assigned to a condition of the independent variable accordingly. Though physical appearance study lends itself to this method, many confounding factors may arise as a result. In the proposed study, the same actress will be the stimulus in all conditions. Only her breast size and the position for which she is applying will be manipulated. This methodology should eliminate possible confounding factors of variables other than breast size, which could otherwise affect results.

The prediction most central to the present study is that the same applicant, giving essentially the same interview, will be given different job success ratings due to variations in her breast size. The large-breasted applicant should be rated higher for the femininely sex-typed clerical position, while the small-breasted applicant should be rated higher for the masculinely sex-typed managerial position.

Secondary predictions relate to attractiveness and femininity issues. The breast sizes manipulated here (34A and 34B) are associated with ratings of low or high attractiveness, respectively. Based on the findings presented in recent literature, the small-breasted applicant should be judged less attractive, while the large-breasted applicant should be considered more attractive. Based on other studies, it is expected that this effect will be stronger for male participants than for female participants.

Additionally, larger breasts have been shown to be considered more feminine. This

should result in the applicant being rated more feminine in the large-breasted condition than in the small-breasted condition.

Sex of participant will be included as a factor because breasts are very sexually stimulating to men (Wildman et al., 1976), and men rate larger breasts slightly more favorably than do women (Gitter et al., 1983). Most research on breast attractiveness ratings shows an effect of participant sex, with males favoring slightly larger breasts than females (Jacobi & Cash, 1994; Thompson & Tantleff, 1992). Because of this, it is not unreasonable to expect that males might hire large-breasted women more than small-breasted women for both job types, independent of the woman's fit to the job.

Kenrick, Montello, Guterres, and Trost (1993) found that participants experienced elevated mood after viewing attractive members of the opposite sex. Since large breasts are attractive to males, they should have an elevated mood after viewing the larger-breasted applicant. Thus, the men in this study might be biased toward large-breasted women because they are in a better mood after viewing them.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Students in an introductory psychology course at Loyola University of Chicago volunteered for the study and gained course credit for their participation. Participants were 202 undergraduates (85 men, 117 women).

Design

A factorial design was used, with the independent variables being Participant Sex (male or female), Applicant Breast Size (small or large), and Job Type (managerial or clerical).

Materials

The videotapes were prepared similarly to those in Pingitore et al. (1994). To minimize differences between tapes, the same actress was used for all videotapes. The actress wore a somewhat form-fitting shirt and removed her suit jacket at the beginning of the interview, so that her breast size was not concealed. The actress modified the appearance of her breast cup size by wearing either a bilateral mastectomy prosthesis in size 34B, or by wearing an athletic bra in "size 34 fits ABC," that minimized her breast cup size. Both the actress and the experimenter agreed that the most accurate judgement of the applicant's breast size was between a 34A and a 34B. Thus the actress wore the cup-size-minimizing athletic bra to more accurately represent a size 34A. Borrowing terminology from the literature, the applicant appeared to be a size 34B+ when wearing the prosthesis, and a size 34A when wearing the athletic bra. These sizes were chosen based on the attractiveness ratings of different breast sizes in the research literature. All materials used are listed in Appendix A.

The actors were recruited using signs and word-of-mouth, in the Chicago area, and both were experienced at acting for a job interview. The actors were instructed to act the same in each video by using the same vocal tone, mannerisms, and posture. To further ensure that the tapes varied as little as possible between breast size conditions, the actress was permitted to view herself only for a very limited time in each condition, to ensure her hair was the same.

Each condition was taped several times, and then edited for differences to match the tapes of each condition most precisely. The interviewer asked the applicant questions for both interviews and was instructed to keep wording, reactions, facial expressions, etc., the same each time.

The actors had one script (presented in Appendix B), which they used for each job condition. The interview dialogue focused on the applicant's job experiences, traits, and personality. The script contained general questions that were applicable to both job types so that a single script could be used for all conditions. Additionally, the applicant provided information about her skills that was applied to the traits needed for both the managerial and clerical position. Participants were told that they were viewing segments of the job interview that had been spliced together, so that they would not be suspicious about the brevity of job-relevant information presented in the videotape. The simulated interview lasted approximately five minutes.

Job descriptions stating performance traits important to each job type were given to the participants before they saw the simulated interview. Performance traits were those used in Heilman and Stopeck (1985a). The job description for the managerial position requested an individual proficient in personnel handling, position knowledge, motivating subordinates, and innovation. The description for the clerical job requested an individual proficient in following a task through to completion, dependability, efficiency, and accuracy. See Appendix C for job descriptions.

The script, a segment of the applicant's resume, and the applicant's scores on relevant tests as compared to the average test scores of the other candidates (the latter two presented in Appendix D) were developed with the goal of presenting an applicant who was average on the qualities needed for each job. Extreme qualification or lack of qualification was avoided, as treatment effects may have been minimized if an extremely qualified or an extremely unqualified applicant was used. To ensure this was achieved, the script, job descriptions, brief resume, and test scores were pilot tested to ascertain that the applicant would appear average in qualifications for each job type. Unfortunately, access to participants for the pilot tests were limited. This necessitated use of small samples (usually about ten participants per group).

For Hiring, the clerical evaluation was slightly higher than average ($M = 5.67$, $S.D. = 1.21$), and the managerial evaluation was average ($M = 5.00$, $S.D. = .63$). For Success, the clerical evaluation was slightly higher than average ($M = 5.83$, $S.D. = 1.17$), and the managerial evaluation was average ($M = 1.17$, $S.D. = .75$). For Promotion, the clerical rating was again, slightly higher than average ($M = 5.5$, $S.D. = 1.05$) and the managerial evaluation was average ($M = 4.83$, $S.D. = .98$). For Salary, the clerical evaluation was average ($M = 27,833$, $S.D. = 2.71$) and the managerial evaluation was slightly lower than average ($M = 58,333$, $S.D. = 4.08$). These means were achieved by modifying the materials after each of three pilot tests. The values presented here are for the final materials used.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted over approximately two months. Experimental sessions were run on the half hour, weekdays, and usually with one sex running on a particular day (see Appendix E for a more detailed description of this). If a student accidentally came to an opposite sex session, the student was run separately after the session was completed, when time permitted. Females ran from 11:00 am till 4:00 pm, in

groups of approximately eight. Males ran from 11:00 am till 7:00 pm, in groups of approximately three. Students could register for the experimental session of their choice.

Because students were sometimes seated close together, the room was roughly divided down the middle, with only one job type condition on each side. To facilitate the accurate distribution of forms, those seated in the left section were usually assigned to the clerical condition, and those in the right section were usually assigned to the managerial condition. Students could choose on which side of the room to sit. Each breast size condition was run during the first or second part of the test day, as shown by the table in Appendix E.

The experimenter first gave an overview of the procedures and answered any questions regarding it. She then passed out the instructions. Instructions were identical across all four conditions and are shown in Appendix F. The experimenter read the instructions and then fielded any questions about the participants' task. Informed consent was then obtained. Next the experimenter gave each participant the appropriate job description, brief resume, and applicant test scores. Then the experimenter played the appropriate videotape on a large projection screen. When the interview ended, the experimenter assigned numerical codes to each participant, and instructed them to record their code on each rating form they received. Next, the experimenter passed out the rating forms, which are shown in Appendix G. The rating forms were prelabeled with a blue or black "a" if they were to be given to a female, and a "b" if they were to be given to a male, so that the data could be analyzed according to sex of participant. Forms were also prelabeled with a red "A" for the small-breasted condition, and a red "B" was placed on those used for the large-breasted condition.

Participants rated the degree to which they thought the applicant should be hired on a 7-point scale, where 1 = definitely would not hire and 7 = definitely would hire. They also rated the degree to which they thought the applicant would succeed in the position on a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 = definitely will not succeed, and 7 = definitely will

succeed. They indicated the degree to which they thought the applicant would eventually be considered for promotions on a 7-point scale, where 1 = definitely will not be promoted, and 7 = definitely will be promoted. Finally, applicants were asked to indicate the most appropriate starting salary for the applicant, given a specific range. This range was from \$20,000 - \$35,000 for participants in the clerical position and from \$55,000 to 80,000 for participants in the managerial position. These forms were collected, and another form was distributed, and participants answered several questions about the applicant's appearance and other information from her interview. Embedded in the distractor questions were three hypothesis-relevant questions. Participants rated the applicant's level of attractiveness on a 7-point scale, where 1 = extremely unattractive and 7 = extremely attractive. They also rated the applicants weight on a scale where 1 = extremely underweight and 7 = extremely overweight. Participants rated what breast size they thought the applicant was on a 7-point scale, where 1 = much smaller than average and 7 = much larger than average. Participants rated how feminine they thought the applicant was on a similar scale, where 1 = extremely unfeminine and 7 = extremely feminine. These forms were coded according to sex of participant and breast-size condition as well.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The major dependent variables were Estimated Breast Size, Estimated Weight, Femininity, Attractiveness, Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary. These continuous measures were analyzed using a 2 X 2 X 2 design with Participant Sex, Breast Size, and Job Type as factors.

As a manipulation check, a simple factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on Estimated Breast Size. The result supported that the breast size manipulation was effective. When wearing the bilateral mastectomy prosthesis, the applicant was perceived to have a larger breast size ($M = 4.49$, $S.D. = .74$) than when she was wearing the minimizing, athletic bra ($M = 4.19$, $S.D. = .84$), $F(1, 194) = 7.27$, $p < .01$. There were no main or interaction effects of Participant Sex or Job Type on perception of the applicant's breast size.

Because the applicant appeared to (and, in fact, did) weigh slightly more when wearing the mastectomy prosthesis, a simple factorial ANOVA was also conducted to ascertain that this difference was noticed. The result supports that participants perceived the applicant as being slightly heavier when wearing the prosthesis ($M = 4.54$, $S.D. = .63$) than when wearing the athletic bra ($M = 4.36$, $S.D. = .59$), $F(1, 194) = 4.07$, $p < .05$. There were no main or interaction effects of Participant Sex or Job Type on perception of the applicant's weight.

It was predicted based on related studies that the applicant would be rated more femininely when her breast size was larger. The result of the simple factorial ANOVA on Femininity supported this expectation. The applicant was rated as being more feminine in the large breast size condition ($M = 5.24$, $S.D. = .98$) than in the small breast

size condition ($M = 4.88$, $S.D. = 1.20$), $F(1, 194) = 5.34$, $p < .05$. There were no main or interaction effects of Participant Sex or Job Type on perception of the applicant's level of femininity. The effect of Breast Size on Femininity should be interpreted carefully because the Levene Statistic for this analysis (4.44 , $p < .05$), indicated a slight homogeneity of variance problem.

Also based on past studies, it was expected that the applicant would be rated more attractive in the large breast size condition than in the small breast size condition. To test this, a simple factorial ANOVA was conducted with Attractiveness as the dependent variable. The result indicated that there was a marginally significant effect of Participant Sex X Breast Size, $F(1,194) = 3.15$, $p = .08$. Simple effects analyses showed that the nature of this interaction was contrary to expectation. Men rated the large-breasted applicant less attractive ($M = 3.54$, $S.D. = 1.05$) than did the women ($M = 4.15$, $S.D. = .93$), $F(1,194) = 8.9$, $p < .01$. There was not a significant difference between how attractive the men rated the small-breasted applicant ($M = 3.82$, $S.D. = 1.11$) and how attractive the women rated the small-breasted applicant ($M = 3.91$, $S.D. = 1.03$), $F(1,194) = .23$, n.s. The findings just discussed should be interpreted carefully because the Levene Statistic for the effect of Participant Sex on Attractiveness (5.04 , $p < .05$) indicated a slight homogeneity of variance problem.

There was a statistically significant effect of Participant Sex X Job Type on Attractiveness, $F(1,194) = 4.44$, $p < .05$. Simple effects analyses showed that females rated the applicant more attractive in the clerical position ($M = 4.17$, $S.D. = 1.10$) than did males ($M = 3.51$, $S.D. = 1.10$), $F(1, 194) = 10.44$, $p < .01$. However, when the applicant was in the managerial condition, there was not a significant difference between how attractive women rated her ($M = 3.90$, $S.D. = .83$) and how attractive men rated her ($M = 3.86$, $S.D. = 1.05$), $F(1,194) = .04$, n.s.

Because the Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary measures were chosen to examine the same concept, a correlation matrix was created to assess the correlation

between these ratings. The matrix shown in Table 1 shows that the Hiring, Success, and Promotion ratings were all highly positively correlated, while the correlation between Salary and each of these three variables was not as strong.

Table 1

Correlation Matrix for Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary

	<u>Hiring</u>	<u>Success</u>	<u>Promotion</u>	<u>Salary</u>
<u>Hiring</u>	1.0000	.7385 p = .000	.6111 p = .000	.4283 p = .000
<u>Succeed</u>	.7385 p = .000	1.0000	.6715 p = .000	.4050 p = .000
<u>Promotion</u>	.6111 p = .000	.6715 p = .0000	1.0000	.3413 p = .000
<u>Salary</u>	.4283 p = .000	.4050 p = .000	.3413 p = .000	1.0000

Since the correlation between Hiring, Success, and Promotion was positive and strong, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on these three variables. This MANOVA yielded no statistically significant effects with alpha set at the standard .05 level. However, there was a marginally significant interaction between Participant Sex and Breast Size, $F(3,192) = 1.77$, $p = .16$. In addition, this interaction reached significance for two of the three univariate tests: Hiring, $F(1,194) = 4.25$, $p < .05$; Promotion, $F(1,194) = 4.27$, $p < .05$; and Success, $F(1,194) = 3.51$, $p < .06$.

Simple effects analyses were conducted to further explore the interaction effects. Contrary to expectations, these analyses showed that males gave the applicant higher hiring ratings when she had smaller breasts ($M = 5.23$, $S.D. = .83$) than did females ($M = 4.74$, $S.D. = 1.29$), $F(1,192) = 4.88$, $p < .05$. When the applicant had larger breasts, there

was no significant difference between the hiring ratings that men gave her ($M = 4.95$, $S.D. = .95$) and those that women gave her ($M = 5.12$, $S.D. = 1.18$), $F(1,192) = .56$, $n.s.$ The interaction effect on Hiring should be cautiously interpreted because the Levene Statistic for the effect of Participant Sex on Hiring was significant (4.87 , $p < .05$).

Males rated the applicant's likelihood of success at the job higher ($M = 5.45$, $S.D. = 1.0$) than did females ($M = 4.98$, $S.D. = 1.13$), $F(1,192) = 5.07$, $p < .05$, when the applicant had smaller breasts. When the applicant was large-breasted, there was not a significant difference between the success ratings males gave her ($M = 5.41$, $S.D. = .84$) and the success ratings females gave her ($M = 5.51$, $S.D. = 1.12$), $F(1,192) = .19$, $n.s.$

Females rated the applicant more likely to succeed with large breasts ($M = 5.51$, $S.D. = 1.12$) than with small breasts ($M = 4.98$, $S.D. = 1.13$), $F(1, 192) = 7.36$, $p < .01$. However, there was not a significant difference between males' success ratings for the applicant when she was large-breasted ($M = 5.41$, $S.D. = .84$) and when she was small-breasted ($M = 5.45$, $S.D. = 1.0$), $F(1,192) = .03$, $n.s.$

Females thought the applicant was more likely to be promoted when she had large breasts ($M = 5.03$, $S.D. = 1.33$) than when she had small breasts ($M = 4.29$, $S.D. = 1.40$), $F(1,192) = 9.13$, $p < .01$. However, there was no significant difference between the promotion ratings men gave the large-breasted applicant ($M = 4.68$, $S.D. = .99$) and the promotion ratings they gave the small-breasted applicant ($M = 4.73$, $S.D. = 1.42$), $F(1,192) = .02$, $n.s.$

Since the Salary measure was not included in the MANOVA just discussed, a simple factorial analysis was conducted on this variable. It showed no significant main or interaction effects. It is possible that effects were found for the conceptually similar variables of Hiring, Success, and Promotion, but not for Salary, because this variable was measured differently. Since the participants were not experienced in making personnel decisions, they may have been able to express their evaluations well with the 1-7 scales, but not with the measure of an actual salary.

It was expected that perception of the applicant's attractiveness might be contributing to the interaction of Breast Size and Participant Sex on Hiring, Success, and Promotion. As well, the results suggest that regardless of Job Type, participants rated the applicant more favorably when they thought she was more attractive. Thus an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted on Hiring, Success, and Promotion with the Attractiveness rating used as a covariate.

For this ANCOVA the interaction of Breast Size and Participant sex was not significant $F(3,191) = 1.21, p = .31$. The univariate F-test for Hiring, $F(1,193) = 2.95, p < .10$, was not significant at the alpha level set a priori (.05), with Attractiveness as the covariate, $t(194) = 2.91, p < .01$. There was no significant interaction effect on Success $F(1,193) = 2.36, p < .15$, using Attractiveness as the covariate, $t(194) = 2.82, p < .01$. There was not a significant effect for Promotion $F(1,193) = 2.81, p < .15$, using Attractiveness as the covariate, $t(194) = 3.43, p < .01$. These results indicate that while attractiveness appears to explain part of the interaction between Breast Size and Participant Sex on Hiring, Success, and Promotion, there may also be other factors causing this interaction.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The results did not support the main hypothesis that the large-breasted applicant would be rated better for the femininely sex-typed clerical position, while the small-breasted applicant would be rated better for the masculinely sex-typed managerial position. This is shown by the lack of interaction effect between Breast Size and Job Type on the Variables of Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary.

Based on past studies it was predicted that the applicant would be perceived as more feminine in the large breast size condition than in the small breast size condition. The results found here confirmed this prediction. According to the Lack of Fit model however, the more feminine applicant should have received more favorable ratings for the clerical job, and the less feminine applicant should have received more favorable ratings for the managerial job. This did not occur. The effect of Attractiveness here may have overcome the effects of sex and job stereotyping, thus causing the results to contradict the Lack of Fit model.

Previous studies supported the hypothesis that the applicant would be considered more attractive in the large breast condition than in the small breast condition. However, in the present study this was true only for females. The males in this study rated the applicant significantly less attractive in the large breast size condition than did the females. As well, the males rated the small-breasted applicant more attractive than the large-breasted applicant.

The reason why this occurred is unclear. It is possible that males, either consciously or subconsciously, have different attractiveness standards for women according to whether their relationship to them is professional or social. If this is correct,

males may not have rated the applicant more attractive with large breasts because they were asked to make judgements about her in a professional situation. Perhaps they would have rated the applicant as they did in previous studies (more attractive with large breasts) if she was in a social setting, or if they were asked about a dating relationship with her. In contrast, perhaps females don't respond this way because they have only one attractiveness standard for women, and that standard involves larger breast size as more attractive.

The results of this study may not be generalizable outside of the controlled environment used. The raters in this study were college students, and actual personnel managers in business settings may behave differently. Another limitation of this experiment is the fact that while great attempts were made to control all extraneous factors, it is possible that even trivial differences in the videotapes could have somewhat influenced the effects found.

Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is that it finds a small effect of breast size on hiring decisions, an association which has previously not been investigated. Further, this study finds that the effect of breast size is related to perceptions of attractiveness. The prediction was made that participants would rate the applicant better on Hiring, Success, Promotion, and Salary when they viewed her as more attractive. The results support this prediction for Hiring, Success, and Promotion. That is, females considered the applicant more attractive when she appeared large-breasted than when she appeared small-breasted. As well, females rated the applicant more favorably on Hiring, Success, and Promotion when she appeared large-breasted (and thus more attractive to them). In contrast, men rated the applicant more attractive when she was small-breasted than when she was large-breasted. Males rated the applicant more favorably on Hiring, Success and Promotion when she was small-breasted, (and thus, more attractive to them).

The ANCOVA conducted to investigate the role of Attractiveness on the Hiring, Success, and Promotion variables showed that the interaction between Participant Sex and Breast Size did decrease when Attractiveness was used as a covariate. However the decrease was not extreme. This suggests that attractiveness is part of the reason for rating equally qualified applicants differently, but that other factors likely influence these ratings as well.

That people rate a female applicant more favorably when they find her more attractive, even when she is applying for a managerial position, is in disagreement with findings that attractiveness is disadvantageous to women in managerial positions (Heilman & Stopeck, 1985a; Heilman & Saruwatari, 1979). Thus, further exploration of this issue would be interesting.

Future research could also be directed toward examining the effect of specific physical attributes on hiring decisions. With the exception of weight prejudice studies, this area is lacking. Recently however, legal conflict involving the Americans with Disabilities Act has made it necessary to more specifically examine attractiveness bias in work settings (McAdams, Moussavi, & Klassen, 1992). The issue of actual disfigurement versus mere unattractiveness is one such area that has been addressed. Continued efforts to examine such specific factors as facial attractiveness, breast size, or height could clarify the results of the present study as well as uncover new findings important to employment decisions.

Finally, that physical attractiveness affects hiring decisions should be further investigated simply because it undermines accurate and fair hiring processes. Thus, research is needed to identify the degree to which attractiveness bias exists, the factors which promote it, and the settings in which it most often occurs.

APPENDIX A
LIST OF MATERIALS USED

VCR, projector, projection screen, provided by Loyola University Chicago

JC Penney's bilateral mastectomy prosthesis (external)

Bestform athletic bra, size 34, ABC

Interview clothing, shoes, and jewelry

APPENDIX B
ACTORS' SCRIPT

(As the scene starts, the interviewer is opening the door and the actress walks in. They introduce themselves).

interviewer: Hi, I'm John Connors. It's a pleasure to meet you. (He extends his hand.)

applicant: (shaking interviewer's hand) Susan Brown. It's nice to meet you too.

interviewer: Can I take your jacket?

applicant: Thank you. (Removes jacket and hands it to him.)

interviewer: (Laying applicant's jacket over a nearby chair.) Please, have a seat. (He motions to the chair in front of his desk, or pulls it out for her.) Make yourself comfortable. (As he says this he walks around and sits behind his desk. Then he shuffles some papers, and looks up at the applicant.) Have you always lived in Chicago, Ms. Brown?

(The camera should be pointed at Ms. Brown from an angle, rather than head on, so that her differing breast sizes are apparent).

applicant: No, I haven't. I'm originally from upstate New York, but I've lived in New York City, and I've been in Chicago for the last 2 years. It was a big change coming to such big cities from a small town, but I've grown to love it. I enjoy being close to all the entertainment and different restaurants. The familiarity of a small town is nice, but to me it doesn't compare to all the things a big city has to offer.

interviewer: I did review your resume, but unfortunately I don't have it in front of me right now. Where have you worked previously?

applicant: Well my first job out of school was at an accounting firm-- Stillman & Peters in New York. I was there for a year. When I moved to Chicago I started working at Meyers, Johnson & Schmidt, and that's where I am now. It's going on two years now.

interviewer: What elements do you consider essential to do your job well?

applicant: I think by far the most important thing is to have a positive attitude. I have always tried to look at problems from a positive perspective. I deal with many different people every day, and often times they come to me to get a problem solved. I have found

that whatever their problem may be, it is always easier to solve when set about solving it with a positive attitude. I often have quite challenging work, and if I didn't have the right attitude, it would be easy to postpone the work, or to not do my best. Whenever I need to solve a problem I envision a positive outcome and work on the problem until I've solved it.

interviewer: What do you consider your greatest strengths and weaknesses?

applicant: Moving around a lot as a teenager helped me to learn to interact well with others. I'd have to say one of my strengths is that I can get along with practically any type of person. I adapt well to working with different people, and to different work environments too. The shift from working at Stillman & Peters to working at a company like Meyers, Johnson & Schmidt would have been very challenging to most people, but I was able to fit right in at both places, despite the fact that the work environment and the corporate philosophies were so different. So I'd have to say my ability to adapt to different personalities and different situations is one of my greatest strengths. As far as my strengths that are specifically important to this position, I would say I am quite proficient in handling personnel, I always follow tasks through to completion, and I'm very efficient. Also, because of my past job experience, I have a good deal of knowledge about this position. However, I must admit, one of my main weaknesses is that I sometimes overestimate what can be accomplished in a given time.

interviewer: What accomplishments in your life have given you the most satisfaction, and why?

applicant: One accomplishment in my life had to do with my father joining the military when I was a teenager. I was basically a shy person, and at first I had a really difficult time adjusting to all the moves my family had to make. Sometimes we'd move twice in one school year. Since I was shy, I'd just have made new friends when we'd move again, and then have to start all over. Eventually, though, I came to enjoy all the moving. I really

think it helped me overcome my shyness, so that I'm now rather outgoing. I'm proud of that accomplishment because I feel that I turned a possibly bad situation into a good one.

interviewer: What is it about Rollins, Thompson, Berger that appeals to you?

applicant: As you can probably tell, its size, for one. After being at a midsized insurance company like Meyers, Johnson & Schmidt, I'd really like to change to a small company.

interviewer: I was going to ask a few light hearted questions, just to get to know you. Do you have any hobbies?

applicant: Oh, yes, ... I like ice skating and swimming. I also enjoy reading. (pause) Oh, and just recently I've entered a painting class-- I really like it so far.

interviewer: Actually, a friend of mine teaches a beginner's painting class at the Art Institute. Supposedly they've been getting a really big turnout for the class-- you should check it out. (pause) Let's see... uh... do you have a favorite movie?

applicant: That's a tough question... I've seen so many movies over the years its hard to remember my favorites. I usually like more thought-provoking movies, but I must admit, I really liked Tootsie-- Dustin Hoffman is one of my favorite actors, and I liked Four Weddings and a Funeral. Both of those movies were so funny. I also liked Forest Gump, because it made me step back and see others from another angle.

interviewer: What do you like to read?

applicant: I usually like fictional best sellers--especially Amy Tan books. I've enjoyed all three of her books. They're interesting and true to life but they also have fascinating stories of long ago within them.

interviewer: Oh, I'm familiar with those books. My wife is a big Amy Tan fan as well. Did you read her latest one-- it just came out about a year ago? My wife wants to read it. I forget the name. It was something with--

applicant: Oh, it's called "The Hundred Secret Senses." I did. It was great. I'd definitely recommend it.

interviewer: (Looking at his watch) Well, I've really enjoyed meeting with you, Ms. Brown. Unfortunately, it looks like it's just about time for my next interview. (stands up) There's just a few more people we're considering for the position. We should probably finish up interviewing by the end of this week, and we should be making a decision about the position by the following Tuesday, so you hear from us by then.

applicant: (standing up) I've enjoyed talking with you too. I appreciate your taking the time to interview me. I'll speak to you soon. (Interviewer has extended his hand now and applicant shakes it.)

interviewer: Oh, it was my pleasure. Bye now. (applicant turns to leave, picks up her jacket on the way, folding it over her arms, and interviewer shows applicant through the door. He then closes the door.)

APPENDIX C
JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Managerial Position

Rollins, Thompson, Berger is seeking a manager. The applicant should be proficient in handling personnel, position knowledge, motivating subordinates, and innovation.

Clerical Position

Rollins, Thompson, Berger is seeking an administrative assistant. The applicant should be proficient in following a task through to completion, dependability, efficiency, and accuracy.

APPENDIX D
SECTION OF APPLICANT'S RESUME AND RELEVANT TEST SCORES

G.P.A. 3.0

Past employment:

1995-present, administrative assistant (or manager, depending on condition), Meyers, Johnson, and Schmidt, a mid-sized insurance firm.

1992-1994, administrative assistant (or manager, depending on condition), Stillman & Peters, an accounting firm.

Applicant's scores on 3 relevant tests, as compared with the average score of the other candidates (there are a few people being considered for the position):

	Applicant's score	Average score of the other applicants
Test 1	85%	87%
Test 2	94%	93%
Test 3	87%	89%

APPENDIX E
PARTICIPANT SEX/BREAST SIZE CONDITION SCHEDULE

<u>Date</u>	<u>Participants'</u> <u>sex</u>	<u>Breast size condition</u> <u>for 1st part of session</u>	<u>Breast size condition</u> <u>for 2nd part of session</u>
Monday 9/15/97	female	small	large
Monday 9/22/97	female	large	small
Monday 9/29/97	female	large	small
Wednesday 10/8/97	female	small	large
Thursday 9/18/97	male	small	small*
Friday 9/19/97	male	large	large*
Thursday 9/25/97	male	large	small
Friday 9/26/97	male	large	small
Thursday 10/2/97	male	small	large
Friday 10/3/97	male	large	small
Thursday 10/9/97	male	small	small*
Friday 10/10/97	male	small	large
Wednesday 10/15/97	male	small	small*
Wednesday 10/29/97	male	large	large*
Tuesday 11/4/97	male	small	large

* When lack of time or participants permitted fewer than seven participants to be run in one day, only one breast size condition was used.

APPENDIX F
PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS

Participant Instructions

First read the job description (at the bottom of the page) given to you. Then read the applicant's resume information above it, and her test scores as compared with the average scores of the other candidates for the position. After doing this you will watch a video. The video consists of segments of the job interview for the position described to you. The segments have been spliced together so that you will see an uninterrupted 5 minute video. The applicant in the video is applying for the job described in the handout, and the resume and test scores given to you are hers. As you watch, keep in mind the requirements necessary for the job, as you will be asked to evaluate the applicant's ability for the job and similar questions, after the interview is completed. In addition to listening to the applicant's responses, be sure to watch the applicant to evaluate confidence, presentation, etc. At the end of the interview the experimenter will pass out forms on which you will rate the degree to which you think the applicant should be hired for the job described. You will also be asked to rate other aspects of the applicant's ability for the job. Please fill out only the forms given to you by the experimenter and do not exchange or share any forms with other participants. When you have completed the rating form, please place it face down on the desk in front of the experimenter. When all of the first set of forms are collected, another questionnaire will be distributed. Complete and return this form to the experimenter in the same manner as you did the first. When all forms are returned, you will be debriefed, and then you may leave.

APPENDIX G
RATINGS FORMS

Ratings Forms

Imagine that you are in charge of hiring someone to fill the job description you received. Please indicate the degree to which you think the applicant in the videotape should be hired by placing a check on the appropriate line of the scale.

definitely would
not hire

_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

definitely would
hire

In your opinion, to what degree will the applicant succeed on the job if she is hired?

definitely will
not succeed

_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

definitely
will succeed

In your opinion, what is the likelihood that the applicant will eventually be promoted if she is hired?

definitely will
not be promoted

_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

definitely will
be promoted

(One of the following questions was presented depending on the job type condition of the participant)

An appropriate starting annual salary range for the clerical position applicant is \$20,000-\$35,000. Given this range, what do you think this applicant's salary should be if she is hired?

An appropriate starting annual salary range for the manager position applicant is \$55,000-\$80,000. Given this range, what do you think this applicant's salary should be if she is hired?

Other Questions

Please indicate your opinion by placing a check on the appropriate line.

1. How well did the applicant carry herself (posture, poise) during the interview?

extremely
poorly

____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

extremely
well

2. What was the applicant's hair color?

____ blonde

____ reddish brown

____ grey

3. Where was the applicant originally from?

____ New York

____ Iowa

____ Ohio

____ Hawaii

4. How attractive did you find the applicant?

extremely
unattractive

____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

extremely
attractive

5. How appealing was the applicant's voice? (consider tone, volume, inflection)

extremely
unappealing

____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

extremely
appealing

6. Of what profession was the applicant's father?

____ a police officer

____ a professor

____ in the military

____ a politician

7. How would you describe the applicant's weight?

extremely
underweight

____:____:____:____:____:____:____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

extremely
overweight

8. How would you describe the applicant's demeanor?

____ outgoing ____ a bit shy ____ overly serious

9. What is the best estimate of the applicant's breast size?

much smaller
than average

____:____:____:____:____:____:____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

much larger
than average

10. What color suitcoat was the applicant wearing?

____ navy ____ red ____ tan ____ light grey

11. How would you describe the applicant's level of femininity?

extremely
unfeminine

____:____:____:____:____:____:____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

extremely
feminine

12. How appropriately was the applicant dressed?

very
inappropriately

____:____:____:____:____:____:____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very
appropriately

13. How appropriate was the jewelry the applicant wore?

very
inappropriate

____:____:____:____:____:____:____
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

very
appropriate

14. The applicant wore her hair

____ short and curly ____ pulled up ____ long and free-flowing

APPENDIX H
CONSENT FORM

Consent Form

Fall semester, 1997

I, _____, state that I voluntarily agree to participate in a research project conducted by Carol L. Jarzyna, graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago.

The research is being conducted to investigate factors that influence corporate decision making. The specific task I will perform requires: that I read a job description and view a videotaped interview. I will then perform ratings and answer questions based on the interview. The experiment will last approximately 30 minutes and will be conducted in an on-campus classroom. I agree to not discuss the experiment with any students for one month following the session.

I acknowledge that Carol L. Jarzyna: has explained fully the task to me; has informed me that I may withdraw from participation at any time without prejudice or penalty; has offered to answer any questions that I may have concerning the research procedure; has assured me that any information that I give will be used for research purposes only and will be kept confidential. No names will be recorded and results will be reported with no references to individual participants.

I also acknowledge that the benefits derived from, or rewards given for, my participation have been fully explained to me, as well as the alternatives, if available, for earning these rewards, and that upon my completion of the research task I have been promised a brief description of the role my specific performance plays in this project. I will receive course credit to apply to the Psychology 101 course requirement in return for completion of the study.

I have read the above and understand it.

Signature of Researcher

Signature of Participant

APPENDIX I
DEBRIEFING FORM

Debriefing Form

Please return this sheet before leaving, and do not discuss the study with students who have not done it, for one month following the session.

The social psychology study in which you participated was designed to see if an applicant's breast size has an effect on whether she is hired for either a clerical or managerial position. There were four groups in the study. One group saw a small-breasted applicant interview for a clerical position while another group saw the same small-breasted applicant interview for a managerial position. A third group saw the applicant interview for a clerical position while she was wearing mastectomy prostheses that gave her the appearance of being large-breasted. A fourth group saw the prostheses-wearing applicant interview for a managerial position. The videotape you viewed was simulated, and was relatively identical (except, of course, for the breast size differences) for all conditions.

The qualifications that the applicant possessed were the same when the applicant was small-breasted as they were when the applicant appeared large-breasted. However, it is expected that the applicant will not be perceived as being equally qualified for each position at each breast size. Specifically, it is expected that the applicant will be favored for the managerial position in the small-breasted condition, and disfavored for the clerical position in this condition. As well, it is predicted that she will be favored for the clerical position in the large-breasted condition, and disfavored for the managerial position in this condition. This prediction is based on stereotypes of the jobs and breast sizes presented here, as reported in relevant literature.

It is likely that a report of the results will take months to compile. However, if you are still interested, you may contact the experimenter or the study advisor in a few months, to inquire about the outcome of the study. The experimenter is Carol Jarzyna, and she can be contacted at (773) 975-1822. The advisor for the study is Dr. R. Scott Tindale in the psychology department. If you would like to read research literature pertaining to this study, following are two interesting and informative articles:

Heilman, M. E., & Saruwatari, L. R. (1979). When beauty is beastly: The effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 360-372.

Pingitore, R., Dugoni, B. L., Tindale, R. S., & Spring, B. (1994). Bias against overweight job applicants in a simulated employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 909-917.

REFERENCE LIST

- Beck, S., Ward-Hull, C., & McLearn, P. (1976). Variables related to women's somatic preferences of the male and female body. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 1200-1210.
- Berry, D. S., & McArthur, L. Z. (1985). Some components and consequences of a babyface. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 312-323.
- Birtchnell, S., Whitfield, P. & Lacey, H.J. (1990). Motivational factors in women requesting augmentation and reduction mammoplasty. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 34, 509-514.
- Decker, W. (1987). Attributions based on managers' self representation, sex, and weight. Psychological Reports, 61, 175-181.
- Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 285-291.
- Dippoye, R. L., Fromkin, H. L., & Wiback, K. (1975). Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 39-43.
- Feldman, J. M. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: cognitive processes in performance appraisal. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 127-148.
- Felson, R. B. (1980). Physical attractiveness, grades, and teachers' attributions of ability. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 11, 64-71.
- Gillen, B. (1981). Physical attractiveness: A determinant of two types of goodness. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7, 277-281.

Gitter, A. G., Lomranz, J., Saxe, L., & Bar-Tal, Y. (1983). Perceptions of female physique characteristics by American and Israeli students. The Journal of Social Psychology, 121, 7-13.

Gleitman, H. (1987). Basic Psychology (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Goin, M. K. (1982). Psychological reactions to surgery of the breast. Clinics in Plastic Surgery, 9, 347-354.

Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. In L. Cummings & B. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 5) (pp. 269-298). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Heilman, M. E., & Saruwatari, L. R. (1979). When beauty is beastly: The effects of appearance and sex on evaluations of job applicants for managerial and nonmanagerial jobs. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 360-372.

Heilman, M. E., & Stopeck, M. H. (1985a). Being attractive, advantage or disadvantage? Performance-based evaluations and recommended personnel actions as a function of appearance, sex, and job type. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 35, 202-215.

Heilman, M. E., & Stopeck, M. H. (1985b). Attractiveness and corporate success: Different Causal Attributions for males and females. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 379-388.

Jacobi, L., & Cash, T. (1994). In pursuit of the perfect appearance: Discrepancies among self-ideal percepts of multiple physical attributes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 379-396.

Kaslow, F., & Becker, H. (1992). Breast augmentation: Psychological and plastic surgery considerations. Psychotherapy, 29, 467-473.

Kenrick, D. T., Montello, D. R., Gutierrez, S. E., & Trost, M. R. (1993). Effects of physical attractiveness on affect and perceptual judgements: When social comparison overrides social reinforcement. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *19*, 195-199.

Klassen, M. L., Jasper, C. R., & Harris, R. J. (1993). The role of physical appearance in managerial decisions. Journal of Business and Psychology, *8*, 181-198.

Kleinke, C. L., & Staneski, R. A. (1980). First impressions of female bust size. The Journal of Social Psychology, *110*, 123-134.

Klesges, R., Klem, M., Hanson, C., Eck, L., Ernst, J., O'Laughlin, D., Garrot, A., & Rife, R. (1990). The effect of applicant's health status and qualifications on simulated hiring decisions. International Journal of Obesity, *14*, 527-535.

Mazur, A. (1986). U.S. trends in feminine beauty and overadaptation. The Journal of Sex Research, *22*, 281-303.

McAdams, T., Moussavi, F., Klassen, M. (1992). Employee appearance and the Americans with Disabilities Act: An emerging issue? Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, *5*, 1992.

Pingitore, R., Dugoni, B. L., Tindale, R. S., & Spring, B. (1994). Bias against overweight job applicants in a simulated employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, *79*, 909-917.

Rothblum, E. D., Brand, P. A., Miller, C. T., & Oetjen, H. A. (1990). The relationship between obesity, employment discrimination, and employment-related victimization. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *37*, 251-266.

Schein, V. E., (1975). Relationships between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, *60*, 340-344.

Spiegler, M. (1996). Breast implants: Once is not enough. American Demographics, *18*, 13.

Terry, M. B., Skovron, M. L., Garbers, S., Sonnenschein, E., & Toniolo, P. (1995). The estimated frequency of cosmetic breast augmentation among US women, 1963 through 1988. Public Health Briefs, 85, 1122-1124.

Thompson, J. K., & Tantleff, S. (1992). Female and male ratings of upper torso: Actual, ideal, and stereotypical conceptions. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7, 345-354.

Wiggins, J. S., Wiggins, N., & Conger, J.C. (1968). Correlates of heterosexual somatic preference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 82-90.

Wildman, R. W., Wildman, R. W., II, Brown, A., & Trice, C. (1976). Note on males' and females' preferences for opposite-sex body parts, bust sizes, and bust-revealing clothing. Psychological Reports, 38, 485-486.

VITA

Carol Laurent Jarzyna received her undergraduate degree in psychology from the University of Chicago in 1993. She worked at a behavioral pharmacology research laboratory before entering the graduate program in applied social psychology at Loyola University Chicago, where she is now a student. Currently she is also an instructor in consumer behavior at Columbia College in Chicago.

THESIS APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Carol Laurent Jarzyna has been read and approved by the following committee:

R. Scott Tindale, Ph.D., Director
Professor of Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

Anne Sutter, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

2/5/98
Date


Director's Signature